

LARRY D ROYSTON, )  
)  
Plaintiff, ) 2:21-CV-00051-DCLC  
)  
vs. )  
)  
C R BARD INCORPORATED and )  
BARD PERIPHERAL VASCULAR )  
INCORPORATED, )  
)  
Defendants. )

Defendants C.R. Bard, Inc. and Bard Peripheral Vascular, Inc. (collectively “Defendants”) have filed a motion to dismiss this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 36(a) and 41(b). For the reasons stated herein, the motion is **GRANTED**.

Case 2:21-cv-00051-DCLC-JEM Document 35 Filed 07/12/22 Page 1 of 3 PageID #: 316

Rule 41(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure provides for dismissal when a plaintiff “fails to prosecute or to comply with [the Federal Rules] or a court order.” *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). When entertaining a Rule 41(b) motion to dismiss for failure to prosecute, Tennessee courts consider the following four factors: “(1) whether the party’s failure is due to the willfulness, bad faith, or fault; (2) whether the adversary was prejudiced by the dismissed party’s conduct; (3) whether the dismissed party was warned that failure to cooperate could lead to dismissal; and (4) whether less drastic sanctions were imposed or considered before dismissal was ordered.” *Mullin v. Butler*, 452 F. Supp. 3d 794, 798 (M.D. Tenn. 2020) (quoting *Knoll v. Am. Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 176 F.3d 359, 362 (6th Cir. 1999)). “[A] defendant is prejudiced by the plaintiff’s conduct where the defendant ‘waste[d] time, money, and effort.’” *Mullin*, 452 F. Supp. 3d at 799 (quoting *Schafer v. City of Defiance Police Dep’t*, 529 F.2d 731, 737 (6th Cir. 2008)). Further, “[p]rior notice, or the lack thereof, is . . . a key consideration” in determining whether a district court abused its discretion in dismissing a case for failure to prosecute.” *Id.* “[W]hile pro se litigants may be granted some latitude when dealing with sophisticated legal issues, acknowledging their lack of formal training, there is no cause for extending this margin to straightforward procedural requirements that a lay person can comprehend as easily as a lawyer.” *El v. Metro Nashville Police Dep’t*, No. 3:19-CV-01091, 2021 WL 2316773, at \*2 (M.D. Tenn. June 7, 2021) (internal quotation marks omitted). “When a pro se litigant fails to comply with an easily understood court-imposed deadline, there is no basis for treating that party more favorably than a party who is represented.” *Id.* (internal citation omitted). When a plaintiff fails to prosecute his claims in this manner, his involuntary dismissal “operates as an adjudication on the merits.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

Here, Defendants have been prejudiced by Plaintiff’s failure to appear and prosecute this matter because they have expended time and resources attempting to communicate with Plaintiff, yet despite these efforts have been unable to move forward with discovery or to develop their

defense due to Plaintiff's continued silence and unavailability. Plaintiff has been warned, through communications from his attorney and this Court, that failure to prosecute this matter could lead to dismissal of the case. Finally, less drastic sanctions are not appropriate given that Plaintiff has remained wholly absent from this litigation for months. The factors weigh heavily in favor of dismissal.

Further, Defendants show that on April 4, 2022, counsel for Defendants served Requests for Admission on Plaintiff [Doc. 33-1]. The Requests for Admission included the following statements: "Admit that you have not suffered any bodily injuries as a result of the implantation of the Bard Inferior Vena Cava Filter" and "Admit that you have no damages that are in any way related to the implantation of the Bard Inferior Vena Cava Filter." [Doc. 33-1, ¶¶ 1, 5]. Plaintiff did not respond to these Requests for Admission. Under Rule 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, "a matter is admitted unless, within 30 days after being served, the party to whom [Requests for Admission are] directed serves on the requesting party a written answer or objection addressed to the matter and signed by the party or [his] attorney." Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(a)(3). By not responding to Defendants' Requests for Admissions, Plaintiff has effectively admitted that he has no claim against Defendants.

For the reasons stated above, Defendants' motion to dismiss for failure to prosecute [Doc. 31] is **GRANTED**. Because Plaintiff has effectively admitted he has no cause of action against Defendants, Plaintiff's claims are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. A separate judgment will enter.

SO ORDERED:

s/Clifton L. Corker  
United States District Judge